

# Cosmological Implications of The Bulk Viscous Model With Variable $G$ And $\Lambda$

ARBAB I. ARBAB

*Department of Physics, Faculty of Science, University of Khartoum,  
P.O. 321, Khartoum 11115, Sudan.*

## ABSTRACT

We have investigated the cosmological implications of the bulk viscous cosmological model with variable  $G$  and  $\Lambda$ . These results are found to be compatible with the present observations. The classical cosmological tests for this model encompass the Freese *et al.* ones. The model has some spirits of the Standard Model. The inflationary solution which solves the Standard Model problems is obtained as a special solution. The influence of viscosity is shown to affect the past and the future of the Universe.

PACS number: 98.80.Dr.

## 1. Introduction

We have recently discussed a bulk viscous model with variable  $G$  and  $\Lambda$  in a scenario which conserves energy and momentum [1]. We have found that the model has many interesting features. Various models in the present literature are shown to be equivalent to bulk viscous model. The bulk viscosity coefficient ( $\eta$ ) is usually taken to depend on the energy density ( $\rho$ ) of the cosmic fluid, viz.  $\eta = \eta_0 \rho^n$ , where  $\eta_0$  is a constant and  $n$  is the viscosity ‘index’. It is shown that only models with  $n = 1/2$  are structurally stable. Beesham has shown that the Berman model is equivalent to a bulk viscous model. We, however, have shown that this equivalence is quite general.

The introduction of bulk viscosity is usually accompanied with particles creation, since this term appears as an energy source in the energy conservation equation. It is also shown that the introduction of a variable cosmological constant solves the entropy problem. In this model neither of the two cases appear. This can be understood as the fact that the conservation of energy in cosmology is very restrictive. The conspiracy between the gravitational constant ( $G$ ), cosmological constant ( $\Lambda$ ) and the bulk viscosity is required to accomplish this. These three parameters are found to be related by a new equation.

This model shares some spirits of the Standard Model on one hand and the inflationary model on the other hand. But, in this case the inflation is caused by viscosity effects. The notable feature of this model is the fact that the Standard and the inflationary Models are augmented in one model, and that the inflationary solution does not require the Universe to have the critical energy density.

It is interesting to note that the inflationary solution can be obtained with or without the cosmological constant. Also note that this solution in this model requires  $\eta = \eta_0 \rho$  and  $H \propto \eta_0^{-1}$ , where  $H$  is the Hubble’s constant. So the smaller is the value of  $\eta_0$  the bigger is the inflation rate. This solution has been obtained by Murphy (1973) where he attributed the viscosity effect to gravitons production in the graviton-graviton scattering. The physical existence of this bulk viscosity is still needed to be studied. On the other hand, if it has been proved that the gravitational constant is varying with cosmic time, then this cosmology becomes the next candidate.

A variation of  $G$  has many interesting consequences both in geology and astrophysics. Canuto and Narlikar [9] have shown that the  $G$  varying cosmology is consistent with whatsoever cosmological observations presently available.

In this paper we would like to discuss the cosmological implications of this model. Recently, Waga [2] has discussed these implications in decaying vacuum energy flat models but with  $G$  constant. We have shown that the model of Freese *et al.* can be reproduced from this model. As for Freese *et al.*, the nucleosynthesis constraints restrict  $\beta$  to be  $\beta < 0.1$ . Complying with the recent values of the age of the Universe our model fits very well.

## 2. The Model and Field equations

In a Robertson Walker universe

$$d\tau^2 = dt^2 - R^2(t) \left[ \frac{dr^2}{1 - kr^2} + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2) \right] \quad (1)$$

where  $k$  is the curvature index.

Einstein's field equations with time dependent cosmological and gravitational "constants"

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}R = 8\pi GT_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} \quad (2)$$

and the perfect fluid energy-momentum tensor

$$T_{\mu\nu} = (\rho + p)u_\mu u_\nu - pg_{\mu\nu} \quad (3)$$

, in the presence of bulk viscosity, give [1]

$$3(p^* + \rho)\dot{R} = -\left(\frac{\dot{G}}{G}\rho + \dot{\rho} + \frac{\dot{\Lambda}}{8\pi G}\right)R. \quad (4)$$

where  $p^* = p - 3\eta H$  and  $\eta$  is the coefficient of viscosity. The conservation of energy requires

$$\dot{\rho} + 3H(\rho + p) = 0. \quad (5)$$

The pressure ( $p$ ) and the energy density ( $\rho$ ) are related by the equation of the state

$$p = (\gamma - 1)\rho, \quad \gamma = \text{const.} \quad (6)$$

Therefore, eq.(4) yields

$$9\eta H\dot{R} = \left(\frac{\dot{G}}{G}\rho + \frac{\dot{\Lambda}}{8\pi G}\right)R \quad (7)$$

We take the ansatz [6,8]

$$\Lambda = 3\beta H^2, \quad \beta = \text{const.} \quad (8)$$

Lima *et al.* argued in favor of a term of the type  $\Lambda \sim H^2$ . They assumed, on dimensional grounds, that  $\Lambda \sim \frac{1}{t_{Pl}^2} \left(\frac{t_{Pl}}{t_H}\right)^n$  where  $t_H$  is the Hubble's time,  $t_{Pl}$  and  $\ell_{Pl}$  are respectively the Planck's time and length. They take  $n = 2$  in order to get rid of the  $\hbar$  dependence, since the gravitational effects today are described by some classical theory of gravity. Therefore, since  $t_H \sim H^{-1}$  they concluded that  $\Lambda \propto H^2$ . On the other hand, the constancy of the parameter  $\beta = \rho_v/(\rho + \rho_v)$  ( $\rho_v$  is the vacuum energy density) proposed by Freese *et*

al. is equivalent, at the level of the Einstein's equations, to considering  $\Lambda = 3\beta H^2$  too. Equation (7) can be written as

$$9\eta \frac{H}{R} = \frac{G'}{G} \rho + \frac{\Lambda'}{8\pi G}, \quad (9)$$

where a prime denotes derivative w.r.t scale factor  $R$  while a dot is the derivative w.r.t to cosmic time  $t$ . In what follows we will consider a flat universe,  $k = 0$ . The density parameter ( $\Omega$ ) is given by

$$\Omega = \frac{8\pi G \rho}{3H^2} = (1 - \beta). \quad (10)$$

The solution of eq.(9), using eqs.(5), (6), (8) and (10) yields

$$R(t) = [3D\gamma(1-n)]^{[1/3\gamma(1-n)]} t^{[1/3\gamma(1-n)]}, \quad D = \text{const.} \quad (11)$$

The Hubble parameter is  $H_0 = \frac{1}{3(1-n)} \frac{1}{t_0}$  and the deceleration parameter is  $q_0 = -\frac{R\ddot{R}}{\dot{R}^2}|_0 = 2 - 3n$ ,  $0 \leq n \leq 1$  (the subscript 0 denotes a present day quantity). This gives  $-1 \leq q_0 \leq 2$ .

### 3. Lookback Time

The radiation travel time (or lookback time)  $t - t_0$  for a photon emitted by a source at instant  $t$  and received at  $t_0$  is

$$t_0 - t = \int_R^{R_0} \frac{dR}{\dot{R}}, \quad (12)$$

where  $R_0$  is the present scale factor of the Universe. Using eq.(11) one can write

$$R = A't^{1/3(1-n)} \quad A' = \text{const.}, \quad (13)$$

it follows that

$$\frac{R_0}{R} = 1 + z = \left(\frac{t_0}{t}\right)^{1/3(1-n)}, \quad (14)$$

or

$$t = (1 + z)^{-3(1-n)} t_0. \quad (15)$$

Using eqs.(11) and (15) we can write

$$t_0 - t = \frac{1}{3(1-n)H_0} [1 - (1 + z)^{-3(1-n)}], \quad (16)$$

or

$$H_0(t_0 - t) = \frac{1}{3(1-n)} [1 - (1 + z)^{-3(1-n)}]. \quad (17)$$

For small  $z$  one obtains

$$H_0(t_0 - t) = z - (2 - \frac{3}{2}n)z^2 + \dots \quad (18)$$

and with  $q = 2 - 3n$  this transform into

$$H_0(t_0 - t) = z - (1 + q/2)z^2 + \dots \quad (19)$$

If we take  $z \rightarrow \infty$  in eq.(17) we readily obtain  $H_0 t_0 = \frac{1}{3(1-n)}$ ;  $n = 1/2$  gives the well-known Einstein-de Sitter (ES) result,

$$H_0(t_0 - t) = \frac{2}{3}[1 - (1 + z)^{-3/2}] \quad (20)$$

We recall that the FRW flat models, as preferred by inflation, have  $q = 1/2$  and  $\Omega = 2q = 1$ , whereas the dynamical estimates yield  $0.1 \leq \Omega \leq 0.4$  [5]. Such a problem can be resolved in our scenario.

#### 4. Proper Distance $d(z)$

A photon emitted by a source with coordinate  $r = r_1$  at time  $t = t_1$  and received at time  $t_0$  by an observer located at  $r = 0$  will follow a null geodesic with  $(\theta, \phi) = \text{const.}$ . The proper distance between the source and the observer is given by

$$d = R_0 \int_R^{R_0} \frac{dR}{\dot{R}R} \quad (21)$$

$$r_1 = \int_{t_1}^{t_0} \frac{dt}{R} = \frac{H_0^{-1} R_0^{-1}}{2 - 3n} [1 - (1 + z)^{3n-2}] \quad (22)$$

hence

$$d = r_1 R_0 = \frac{H_0^{-1}}{2 - 3n} [1 - (1 + z)^{3n-2}] \quad (23)$$

For small  $z$  this becomes

$$H_0 d = z - \frac{2}{3}(1 - n)z^2 + \dots = z - \frac{1}{2}(1 + q)z^2 + \dots \quad (24)$$

Equation (23) gives the Freese *et al.* result for the proper distance if we set  $\Omega = 1 - \beta = 2 - 2n$  viz.,

$$H_0 d = \frac{2}{3\Omega - 2} [1 - (1 + z)^{1-(3/2)\Omega}] \quad (25)$$

As remarked before the ES result is a special case of eq.(23). Equation (23) shows that  $d$  is maximum for  $n \rightarrow 1$  (de Sitter) and minimum for  $n \rightarrow 1/2$  (ES). Now if  $n < 2/3$ , at  $t_0$ , the observer cannot see any source beyond the proper distance of the particle horizon [2]

$$d(z = \infty) = \frac{H_0^{-1}}{2 - 3n} \quad (26)$$

and for  $2/3 < n < 1$ ,  $d(z = \infty)$  is always infinite.

## 5. Luminosity Distance

This generalizes the inverse-square law of the brightness in the static Euclidean space to an expanding curved space [2]

$$d_L = \left(\frac{L}{4\pi\ell}\right)^{1/2} = r_1 R_0(1+z) \quad (27)$$

where  $L$  is the total energy emitted by the source per unit time,  $\ell$  is the apparent luminosity of the object and  $r_1$  is the coordinate distance. For flat universe  $d = r_1 R_0(1+z)$  and therefore one can write

$$d_L = d(1+z) . \quad (28)$$

Using eq.(23) one gets

$$H_0 d_L = \frac{1+z}{2-3n} [1 - (1+z)^{3n-2}] . \quad (29)$$

For  $n = 1/2$  the above equation gives back the ES result,

$$d_L = \frac{2}{H_0} [(1+z) - (1+z)^{1/2}] . \quad (30)$$

For small  $z$  eq.(29) gives

$$H_0 d_L = z + \frac{1}{2}(1-q)z^2 = z + \frac{1}{2}(3n-1)z^2 + \dots \quad (31)$$

## 6. Angular Diameter

The angular diameter of a light source of proper distance  $D$  at  $r = r_1$  and  $t = t_1$ , observed at  $r = 0$  and  $t = t_0$  is given by

$$\delta = \frac{D}{r_1 R_1} = \frac{D(1+z)^2}{d_L} . \quad (32)$$

The angular diameter distance ( $d_A$ ) is defined as the ratio of the source diameter to its angular diameter

$$d_A = \frac{D}{\delta} = r_1 R_1 = d_L(1+z)^{-2} . \quad (33)$$

Applying eq.(29) we obtain

$$d_A = \frac{H_0^{-1}}{2-3n} \frac{[1 - (1+z)^{3n-2}]}{[1+z]} . \quad (34)$$

The maximum of  $d_A$  for our model occurs at

$$1 + z_m = [3(1 - n)]^{1/(2-3n)} \quad (35)$$

while for the Freese *et al.* occurs at [2]

$$1 + z_m = \left(\frac{3}{2}\Omega\right)^{2/(3\Omega-2)}. \quad (36)$$

For  $n = 1/2$  we recover the ES result, viz.  $z_m = 5/4$ .

## 7. Number Counts

The number of astronomical sources in the volume element  $dV$  at coordinate  $r = r_1$  is given by

$$dN = nR^3r_1^2d\Omega dr_1 \quad (37)$$

where  $n$  is the number density of the sources and

$$dV = R^3r_1^2d\Omega dr_1, \quad d\Omega = \sin\theta d\theta d\phi \quad (38)$$

Since the number of these object is conserved, we can write

$$dN = n_0R_0^3r_1^2d\Omega dr_1 \quad (39)$$

or

$$dN = n_0(r_1R_0)^2d\Omega \frac{dR_0r_1}{dz}dz \quad (40)$$

Upon using eq.(29) this transforms into

$$dN = \frac{n_0}{(2-3n)^2 H_0^3} \frac{[1 - (1+z)^{3n-2}]^2}{[1+z]^{3-3n}} d\Omega dz. \quad (41)$$

For  $n = 1/2$  we recover the ES result, namely

$$dN = \frac{4n_0}{H_0^3} \frac{[1 - (1+z)^{-1/2}]^2}{[1+z]^{3/2}} d\Omega dz. \quad (42)$$

This has a maximum value at  $z = \left[\frac{7-9n}{3-3n}\right]^{1/(2-3n)} - 1$  whereas in the case of ES this occurs at  $z = 16/9$  ( i.e. when  $n = 1/2$ ).

Equations (17), (23), (29), (34) and (41) are our predictions for the corresponding cosmological tests. They are in agreement with the results of the Freese *et al.* provided that the substitution  $\Omega = 1 - \beta = 2 - 2n$  is made. According to the Freese *et al.* only models with  $\beta < 0.1$  are consistent with the Standard Model nucleosynthesis constraints. Hence one obtains a restriction on  $n$ , viz.  $n < 0.55$  in that epoch.

## 8. Concluding Remarks

In this work we have discussed the cosmological implications of the bulk viscosity model with variable  $G$  and  $\Lambda$ . The results for the cosmological tests are compatible with the present observations. The model of the Freese *et al.* is retrieved from this model for a particular choice of  $n$ . The Einstein - de Sitter results are obtained for the case  $n = 1/2$ . While the parameter  $\beta$  is a free parameter in the Freese *et al.* model, it is a measure of viscosity in our present model. These tests are found to depend on  $\beta$  (or  $n$ ) only. The proposed model resembles the Standard Model in some respect and gives rise to inflation for the case  $n = 1$ . The model shows the importance of the influence of the bulk viscosity in the evolution of the Universe. Further studies are needed to account for the existence of this bulk viscosity.

## References

- 1- Arbab, A.I. *Gen. Rel. Gravit.*29,61(1997)
- 2- Waga, I., *Astroph. J.* 414, 436, 1993
- 3- Lima, J.A.S., & Maia, J.M.F., *Mod. Phy. Lett.A*, 8, 591 (1993)
- 4- Beesham, A. *Phy. Rev.D*48, 3539, 1993
- 5- Peebles, P.J.E, *Nature* 321, 27 (1986)
- 6- K.Freese, F.C.Adams, J.A.Frieman and E. Mottola *Nuc.Phys.B*287, 797(1987)
- 7- G.L.Murphy, *Phys. Rev.D*8, 4231(1973)
- 8- Lima Carvalho Waga *Gen. Rel. Gravit.*26, 909(1994)
- 9- V.M. Canuto and J.N. Narlikar *Astroph. J.*,6, 236(1980)